DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 791 CG 017 994

AUTHOR Moore, William S.
TITLE The Maryland Career Course: Type/Learning Style Issues. Brief Report #2.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 21p.; For related document, see CG 017 995.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Planning; Classification; *Cognitive Style; Course Content; Higher Education; Interest Inventories; *Personality Theories; Undergraduate Students; *Vocational Interests
IDENTIFIERS *Hollands Hexagonal Model; *Myers Briggs Type Indicator; Strong Campbell Interest Inventory; University of Maryland College Park

ABSTRACT

The Maryland career course is a one-credit career planning course for undecided undergraduates which has provided training for teaching apprentices, and research on students' career decision making. To investigate typology differences in the population enrolling in the course, the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (SCII) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) were used. The results of the SCII are intergated with and organized by Hollands'(1973) model, which describes people and work environments by their resemblance to six categories: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. The MBTI reflects personality type as a four-letter code which represents four basic processes by which people take in information and evaluate or judge that information: Introversion(I)-Extraversion(E); Sensing(S)-Intuiting(N); Thinking(T)-Feeling(F); and Judging(J)-Perceiving(P). Results of examination of students' Holland types showed that Artistic, Enterprising and Social students are the most common in the course, and that Investigative students are significantly underrepresented, suggesting that this group may be more decided as a whole, or less willing to admit career indecision. Results of the MBTI showed that, in general, the course draws more introverts than extroverts (particularly introverted sensors), while all four extroverted sensing types are underrepresented. There was significant overlap between the Holland and Myers-Briggs models, indicating that they are describing similar phenomena with different labels. Data on the range of types in the course population are useful in designing activities and in insuring a wide range of approaches. (Overviews of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Myers-Briggs Learning Styles, Career Exploration worksheets, and data tables are appended.) (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253791

THE MARYLAND CAREER COURSE:

Brief Report #2

Type/Learning Style Issues

Summer, 1983

William S. Moore
Course Coordinator

CG 017994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William S. Moore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In the fall of 1975, the University of Maryland, College Park initiated a one-credit career planning course for undecided undergraduates. While the content of this course was, and continues to be, similar to other like courses described in the literature (Haney and Howland, 1978), it was unique in that it was designed as an explicitly developmental intervention. Based on William Perry's (1970) model of intellectual and ethical development, Knefelkamp and Slepitza's (1976) career adaptation of Perry's work, and Knefelkamp's (1974) and Widick's (1975) Developmental Instruction process design model, the Maryland career course was found to have significant positive impact on the students enrolled (Touchton, et al, 1977).

Initiated jointly by the Career Development Center with the graduate department in Counseling and Personnel Services, the Maryland career course has provided training for teaching apprentices as well as research on students' career decision making. For example, Payne (1980) examined patterns in Holland typologies of students in the course as measured by the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory; Payne et al (1982) used Holland's My Vocational Situation to compare students enrolled in the course with drop-in users of the career library, finding significant differences on all four scales of the instrument. The present report is the second of a series of reports on the ongoing research on the Maryland career course, focussing this time on typology differences in the course population.

Holland Types and the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory

One of the assignments in the Maryland career course is the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (SCII) (Campbell and Hansen, 1981). Students complete the instrument early in the semester and then have the results interpreted when the computer profiles return. In the interim, the students are introduced to the work of J. L. Holland (1973) as a way of understanding their interests and as a framework for exploring majors and careers. Since its results are integrated with and organized by Holland's model, the SCII becomes a useful tool for students in raising possible areas for exploration or confirming tentative directions. A secondary benefit is the opportunity to study patterns of types in the course population, especially since information on types influences the design of the career course (Cornfeld and Knefelkamp, 1979).

J. L. Holland's (1978) work is arguably the most widely-used model in the career counseling field, and thus will not be presented in any depth in this report. Briefly, the model can be characterized by three major points borne out by Holland's initial research and most subsequent studies:

1. People can be described in terms of their resemblance to six personality typologies: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional.
2. Work environments can also be described by their resemblance to six model environments: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional.
3. Success and satisfaction on the job is related to the appropriateness of the match between personality type and chosen work environment.

In examining the Holland types of the students enrolled in the Maryland career course there are some interesting differences. Table 1 displays the number of males and females in the course characterized by the six Holland themes measured by their highest scale on the general theme scores of the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory. Overall, Artistic, Enterprising and Social students are the most common in the current population, while Investigative students are significantly underrepresented. Thus the course seems to draw a broad range of students with the exception of Investigative, students who are typically most comfortable in areas like science and engineering. The latter group may either be more decided as a whole, or less willing and/or able to admit to indecision by registering for a career course. Stereotypically, Enterprising students (largely business oriented) have a simlarly "decided" attitude, so the relatively high percentage of these students in the career course is somewhat surprising. One possibility is that these students have inclinations toward business but are uncertain about specific directions or have inadequate GPAs to be accepted into the business school

In examining the male-female differences, the chi square is highly significant, as one would expect given the consistent gender differences in interests (Campbell and Hansen, 1981). Since the overall ratio of females:males in the course is almost 2:1, the interesting trends are those which run counter to that general trend - specifically, Social (over 3:1), Realistic (almost 4:1 males to females). Thus even with the unique nature of the career course population, these findings corroborate existing notions of differences in male and female interest patterns (Campbell and Hansen, 1981; Payne, 1980).

The other typology model currently used in the career course is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI is a forced-choice paper and pencil inventory designed to reflect a person's personality type based on the theoretical

work of C. G. Jung (1971). Jung described two attitudes to the world - introversion and extraversion - and four basic functions or processes by which people take in information from the outside world and evaluate or make judgements about the information once perceived. Two of these functions, sensing and intuiting, are perceiving processes, while the other two, thinking and feeling, are judging processes. The creators of the MBTI created a fourth bipolar dimension to reflect the choice of judging or perceiving with respect to one's external environment; hence one's type is reflected by the instrument as a four-letter code which indicates one's preference for each of the four dimensions introversion-extraversion, sensing-intuiting, thinking-feeling and judging-perceiving. Appendix 1 presents an overview of the model and these various dimensions.

The MBTI has been gradually incorporated into the design of the Maryland career course over the past two years for several reasons. First, it is a non-threatening psychological inventory with a substantial amount of supportive research (McCaulley, 1981). While significant career implications are only beginning to be explored, the manual (Myers, 1962) indicates clear tendencies for types to cluster in occupations in theoretically-consistent ways. A number of researchers (e.g., Myers, 1981; Deines, 1974; McCaulley, 1976, 1977) have found consistent clusters in various college majors as well, and this kind of information can be used to discuss patterns with students in ways analogous to the use of the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory. Secondly, the Myers-Briggs types have clear implications for students-as-learners (learning styles), and the MBTI has been used in a variety of studies focusing on the teaching/learning process (McCaulley, 1981). While most of this work has been done at the secondary school level, the curricular design implications are equally pertinent to the college classroom. For example, McCaulley (1976) indicates that sensing types tend to work slowly, in a step by step fashion, based on attending to external cues, while intuitive types work quickly with bursts of energy by means of hypothesis generation and testing. These differences in the processing of information seem to have a powerful influence on educational performance; while the general population is estimated to be 65% to 75% sensing, 99.6% of a sample of 500 adults who dropped out of school before the eighth grade were Sensors, while 59% of 3676 Ivy league freshmen were Intuitives (Myers, 1962). Education typically is concerned with symbols, abstractions and quickness of understanding - all areas in which intuitives excel. These teaching-learning implications make the MBTI an ideal choice for exploring the interactions of cognitive stage and style considerations in the classroom environment. This topic will be addressed in a subsequent report.

Before presenting the MBTI data on the career course population, it is necessary to discuss briefly some of the measurement and the research issues of type data. While a fairly substantial body of research literature has developed on the Myers-Briggs, it has been widely available as an instrument for less than a decade. Much work still needs to be done to refine methods of data analysis with respect to type. At present, most work examining type differences among groups uses a chi square approach called the selection ratio type table (SRTT) (Kainz, 1976). Such an approach is useful in indicating types or groupings of types (see below), which are under- or over-represented in a given sample as compared to a particular comparison population. The problem with this kind of analysis is that the statistics are reported as separate and independent when in fact they are not. Thus, some statistical significance is inevitable, especially given the number of chi squares computed (Kainz, 1976). The second major research issue with the instrument is the complexity of the type table. With sixteen different types, there are often insufficient sample sizes for a number of the individual types. The solution to this problem has been to analyze major groupings (e.g., introverted/ versus extraverted; the combination of perceiving and judging functions often referred to as temperaments -NT, NF, ST, SF- and so on) but these groups share and thus obscure the meanings of any differences found.

Given that background, Tables 2 thru 4 display the SRTT comparisons of the Maryland career course overall with a base population of liberal art students as well as females and males separately. The SRTT displays raw frequencies (N), percentages (%), and the ratios of percentage in sample to percentage in comparison population (I) for each individual type and for all major groupings. Any "I" score over 1 indicates overrepresentation (more of that type or group in the sample than in the comparison population); "I" scores less than 1 indicate an underrepresented type or group. In general, the career planning course draws introverts more than extraverts (particularly introverted sensors), while all four extraverted sensing types are underrepresented. Of the four temperaments, NTs are significantly underrepresented while STs and NFs are slightly overrepresented. In examining specific types, the two highest selection ratios are found with ISTP and ENFJ, although the two most common types in the class are ISTF and INFP. Types conspicuous in their absence are ENTJs, ESTPs, and ESFPs. In breaking the course sample down by gender, tables 3 and 4 reflect some significant differences. NF males, especially INFP, are significally overrepresented as are ISTs, while SFs are underrepresented.

As with the overall sample, introverted males are significantly overrepresented compared to extraverts. The female sample, however, is spread across the types somewhat more evenly, with only introverted sensors, especially ISFJs, being significantly overrepresented. On the other hand, NJs (especially INFJs) are underrepresented in the female career course sample.

Based on McCaulley's (1982) University of Florida data with respect to types and college majors, it seems that types oriented toward business, nursing and education, especially physical education, do not enroll in the career course while students who seem to cluster in the humanities and physical sciences (plus behavioral sciences for males) do seem to be drawn to the course. These trends may suggest that students in the former group decide on their career directions more quickly than do the latter group of students or that they are less likely to see the need for career planning. This data also lends some credence to the contention that the population for the career course can be characterized, by and large, as students who need some assistance in finding a good "fit" or "match" in the university environment, a large part of which involves choosing a compatible major and career direction. For instance, since the educational community demands Extraversion somewhat more than Introversion, and Intuition decidely more than Sensing, ISs would theoretically have the most difficult time in that environment - and they are significantly overrepresented in the career course sample. Further, Introverts who tend to avoid closure (IPs) and thus would be expected to have the most difficult time making career decisions are also significantly overrepresented.

Holland - MBTI Comparisons

As noted earlier, the Myers-Briggs has only recently become relatively popular in career-related settings. Thus, while there would seem to be some logical connections between Holland's model and the Myers-Briggs types, little work comparing the two frameworks has been reported to date. Table 5 displays such a comparison for the Maryland career course population. The fact orientation of Sensors would seem to coincide with the attention to details and precision of the Conventional types, and in fact, 48% of the Conventional students are dominant Sensors - 72% either ST or SF. On the other hand, only 5% of the Artistic students - directly opposite of the Conventional type in Holland's model -- are Sensors. The other predicted link - Intuitive and Investigative - is also borne out by this data. 73% of the Investigative students, with their concern for abstract problems and scientific tasks, are Intuitive. Examining the data by Myers-Briggs groupings, NTs

cluster in the Artistic theme (41%) while NFs-the MBTI group most closely associated with counseling as a profession-cluster in the Artistic and Social themes (56%). It is conceivable that the significant overlap between these two models indicates they are describing similar phenomena with different labels, or that there are simply extensive similarities between the types as defined. Much more work needs to be done in exploring this link as the MBTI becomes more widely used in career applications.

Discussion/Implications

Both typology models - Holland and the Myers-Briggs - have been incorporated successfully into the activities of the Maryland career course, and both have been well-received by students in the course. More importantly, however, the data on the range of types in the course population is useful in designing activities and assignments, and in insuring as much as possible that a range of approaches are taken. For example, Appendix 2 displays a significant Myers-Briggs grouping - Extraverted Sensors, Introverted Sensors, Extraverted Intuitives, and Introverted Intuitives - and the implications of those different types in students' learning styles. At a minimum, these students differ in their approach to the learning environment, their view of the teacher's role, and their sources of support ("preferred assignments") and challenge. Given that all four groups are represented in the career course population, the design challenge is to provide for a variety of activities and assignments which attend to all four of the groups equally. In that way students can do a number of things they enjoy doing as well as a number of things which demand that they try new skills and approaches.

Additionally, type/learning style difference can be used to conceptualize multiple approaches to a particular assignment. Appendix 3 shows two versions - one Sensing, one Intuitive - of a standard career course assignment: "Exploring Careers." Early in the semester, students might be allowed to choose options consistent with their own style, and then as the semester progresses, they could be limited to "out-of-style" options - a Sensor would have to choose the Intuiting options, for example. Similarly, information about individual types can be used by instructors as they analyze and respond to students' written assignments. Given their understanding of the implications of style, instructors could tailor their comments to offer specific challenges to the student. With an Extroverted Intuiter, for instance, the instructor would need to be particularly careful to insist on asking for some facts, for evidence to support assertions, and might challenge

him/her on dealing with routine and the mundane aspects which come with most jobs. Thus, while information about type and learning style is useful at a more global level of course design, it can also be extremely helpful in one-to-one written interaction with students in the course.

Summary

This report has presented a brief overview of the typology models of John Holland and the Myers-Briggs Type Inidicator and some data about type representation in the Maryland career course. The implications of type theories, especially the Myers-Briggs, for learning styles and classroom design have also been explored, with some descriptions of current and future work in the area with the career course activities and assignments. Report #3 will examine the relationship between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Perry model of intellectual development: how do learning style and cognitive stage interact in the classroom environment?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I

GENDER/STYLE COMPARISONS: MARYLAND CAREER COURSE

(Frequencies)

	Artistic	Social	Enterprising	Conventional	Realistic	Investigative
Male	15	7	12	8	18	7
Female	24	25	23	17	5	4
Total	39	32	35	25	23	11
%	(23.5)	(19.3)	(21.1)	(15.1)	(19.5)	(6.6)

Chi square = 23.2, prob. = .0003

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

CAREER PLANNING COURSE OVERALL

N = 166

% = Percentage of this group who fall into this type.
I = Selfselection index (ratio of percent of type in group to % in sample)

SENSING TYPES WITH THINKING	SENSING TYPES WITH FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES WITH FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES WITH THINKING
I S T J	I S F J	I N F J	I N T J
N= 17	N= 10	N= 8	N= 7
%= 10.24	%= 6.02	%= 4.82	%= 4.22
I= 1.40	I= 1.44	I= .96	I= .58
I S T P	I S F P	I N F P	I N T P
N= 10	N= 6	N= 18	N= 13
%= 6.02	%= 3.61	%= 10.84	%= 7.83
I= 1.85	I= 1.29	I= 1.36	I= 1.00
E S T P	E S F P	E N F P	E N T P
N= 4	N= 5	N= 15	N= 11
%= 2.41	%= 3.01	%= 9.04	%= 6.63
I= .64	I= .71	I= .94	I= .82
E S T J	E S F J	E N F J	E N T J
N= 15	N= 7	N= 15	N= 5
%= 9.04	%= 4.22	%= 9.04	%= 3.01
I= .97	I= .71	I= 1.55	I= .40

	N	%	I
E	77	46.39	.85
I	89	53.61	1.17
S	74	44.58	1.09
N	92	55.42	.94
T	82	49.40	.91
F	84	50.60	1.11
J	84	50.60	.97
P	82	49.40	1.04
IJ	42	25.30	1.06
IP	47	28.31	1.29
EP	35	21.08	.82
EJ	42	25.30	.88
ST	46	27.71	1.17
SF	28	16.87	.98
NF	56	33.73	1.19
NT	36	21.69	.71
SJ	49	29.52	1.10
SP	25	15.06	1.07
NP	57	34.34	1.02
NJ	35	21.08	.82
TJ	44	26.51	.84
TP	38	22.89	1.00
FP	44	26.51	1.07
FJ	40	24.10	1.15
IN	46	27.71	.99
EN	46	27.71	.89
IS	43	25.90	1.47
ES	31	18.67	.80

Base population used in calculating selection ratio:
3676 Liberal Arts Students

Table 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CAREER PLANNING COURSE - MALES

N = 59

% = Percentage of this group who fall into this type.
I = Selfselection index (ratio of percent of type in group to % in sample)

SENSING TYPES WITH THINKING	SENSING TYPES WITH FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES WITH FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES WITH THINKING
I S F J	I S F J	I N F J	I N T J
N= 3	N= 1	N= 5	N= 2
%= 13.56	%= 1.69	%= 8.47	%= 3.39
I= 1.85	I= .40	I= 1.68	I= .47
I S T P	I S F P	I N F P	I N T P
N= 5	N= 1	N= 9	N= 6
%= 6.47	%= 1.69	%= 15.25	%= 10.17
I= 2.60	I= .60	I= 1.91	I= 1.30
E S T P	E S F P	E N F P	E N T P
N= 0	N= 1	N= 4	N= 3
%= .00	%= 1.69	%= 6.78	%= 5.08
I= .00	I= .40	I= .71	I= .63
E S T J	E S F J	E N F J	E N T J
N= 5	N= 2	N= 6	N= 1
%= 8.47	%= 3.39	%= 10.17	%= 1.68
I= .91	I= .57	I= 1.75	I= .23

	N	%	I
E	22	37.29	.69
I	37	62.71	1.37
S	23	38.98	.95
N	36	61.02	1.03
T	30	50.85	.94
F	29	49.15	1.08
J	30	50.85	.97
P	29	49.15	1.03
IJ	16	27.12	1.14
IP	21	35.59	1.63
EP	8	13.56	.53
EJ	14	23.73	.83
ST	18	30.51	1.29
SF	5	8.47	.49
NF	24	40.68	1.43
NT	12	20.34	.66
SJ	16	27.12	1.01
SP	7	11.86	.84
NP	22	37.29	1.11
NJ	14	23.73	.93
TJ	16	27.12	.86
TP	14	23.73	1.03
FP	15	25.42	1.03
FJ	14	23.73	1.13
IN	22	37.29	1.33
EN	14	23.73	.76
IS	15	25.42	1.45
ES	8	13.56	.58

Base population used in calculating selection ratio:
3676 Liberal Arts Students

Table 4

CAREER PLANNING COURSE - FEMALES

N = 88

% = Percentage of this group who fall into this type.
I = Selfselection index (ratio of percent of type in group to % in sample)

SENSING TYPES WITH THINKING	SENSING TYPES WITH FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES WITH FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES WITH THINKING
I S T J	I S F J	I N F J	I N T J
N= 6	N= 9	N= 2	N= 4
%= 6.82	%= 10.23	%= 2.27	%= 4.55
I= .93	I= 2.44	I= ..45	I= .63
I S T P	I S F P	I N F P	I N T P
N= 4	N= 4	N= 8	N= 7
%= 4.55	%= 4.55	%= 9.09	%= 7.95
I= 1.39	I= 1.62	I= 1.14	I= 1.02
E S T P	E S F P	E N F P	E N T P
N= 4	N= 3	N= 11	N= 6
%= 4.55	%= 3.41	%= 12.50	%= 6.82
I= 1.21	I= .80	I= 1.30	I= .84
E S T J	E S F J	E N F J	E N F J
N= 8	N= 4	N= 5	N= 3
%= 9.09	%= 4.55	%= 5.68	%= 3.41
I= .97	I= .77	I= .98	I= .45

	N	%	I
E	44	50.00	.92
I	44	50.00	1.09
S	42	47.73	1.17
N	46	52.27	.88
T	42	47.73	.88
F	46	52.27	1.15
J	41	46.59	.89
P	47	53.41	1.12
IJ	21	23.86	1.00
IP	23	26.14	1.19
EP	24	27.27	1.06
EJ	20	22.73	.79
ST	22	25.00	1.06
SF	20	22.73	1.32
NF	26	29.55	1.04
NT	20	22.73	.74
SJ	27	30.68	1.15
SP	15	17.05	1.21
NP	32	36.36	1.09
NJ	14	15.91	.62
TJ	21	23.86	.76
TP	21	23.86	1.04
FP	26	29.55	1.20
FJ	20	22.73	1.08
IN	21	23.86	.85
EN	25	28.41	.92
IS	23	26.14	1.49
ES	19	21.59	.93

Base population used in calculating selection ratio:
3676 Liberal Arts Students

TABLE 5

HOLLAND-MYERS-BRIGGS COMPARISONS MARYLAND CAREER COURSE

HOLLAND CODE

Myers-Briggs Dominant Function		Artistic	Social	Enterprising	Conventional	Realistic	Investigativ
	Sensing	2	9	7	12	4	1
	Intuiting	12	8	8	4	6	4
	Thinking	12	4	13	6	7	1
	Feeling	13	11	7	3	6	5

Chi square = 27.7, prob. = .02

HOLLAND CODE

Myers-Briggs Temperament	Artistic	Social	Enterprising	Conventional	Realistic	Investigativ
ST	5	9	9	12	9	1
SF	2	7	9	6	3	2
NT	15	3	9	2	5	3
NF	17	13	8	5	6	5

Chi square = 30.1, prob. = .01

William S. Moore
Spring, 1984

Appendix 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OVERVIEW OF THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

ATTITUDES - differing ways of channeling psychic energy

Extraverting	Introverting
focus on the objective world around them as opposed to the inner world	focus on the subjective, inner world of ideas and understanding
think best in interactions with people	often bottle up emotions
are more understandable and accessible	prefer working out ideas or problems alone
want to assert themselves onto the world	defend against the impact of the world

FUNCTIONS/PROCESSES - differing ways of perceiving information and judging that information

PERCEIVING

Sensing	Intuiting
are interested primarily in actualities as opposed to possibilities	are interested primarily in possibilities as opposed to actualities
depend on and trust sensory data, their own experiences	are imaginative at the expense of observation
are patient with details and impatient with complexity	have little capacity for tuning into present surroundings
define intelligence as soundness of understanding	tend to make connections quickly and prefer abstract tasks over concrete
	define intelligence as speed of understanding

JUDGING

Thinking	Feeling
are impersonal - value logic over sentiment	regard human values as personal priorities - i.e. judgments of values
pursue a goal of objective truth, independent of personalities and wishes of others	value sentiment more than logic
are naturally critical - likely to question, analyze	are personable, naturally friendly
can organize facts and ideas into logical sequence	are aware of and sensitive to others' feelings - value harmony
tend to suppress feelings and emotions that are incompatible to thinking judgments	like to praise and be praised
pay more attention to ideas than to people	

PREFERENCES - differing modes for dealing with the external world

Perceiving	Judging
want to understand	seek control
are spontaneous and open-minded	like to have things settled
are curious about why	constantly come to conclusions
like to keep decisions open as long as possible	strive for systematic methods - the best way to do things
like to gather as much information as possible	tend to value order and planning
"aim to miss nothing"	"aim to be right"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 2

MYERS-BRIGGS LEARNING STYLES

William S. Moore
April, 1984

	ES	IS	EN	IN
STUDENT'S APPROACH TO THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	•realistic, matter-of-fact •fond of concrete facts, good at details •able to absorb large numbers of facts, data •enjoys audio-visuals, practical tests	•systematic and thorough •absorbs and enjoys facts •likes to keep things factual, stated clearly •attention very selective, guided by inner interests •habitually compares personal past and present situations	•strong on initiative and creative impulse, but not in completing projects •ingenious in group problem-solving •hates routine •works from theory to practice •likes trying new ideas out with others	• works toward solutions in own head •intensely individualistic, determined to the point of stubbornness •sets own pace, standard of quality • tends to follow own curiosity
VIEW OF TEACHER'S ROLE	•information-giver • experiential role model •supporter, nurturer • provider of structure and organization	•good lecturer, explainer •limited self-discloser •provider of structure and organization	•stimulator of ideas •challenger •adversary	•provider of opportunities for independence and creative expression •source of expertise
PREFERRED ASSIGNMENTS	•experiential, "hands on" work •prefers actions to words •fact-oriented, result-oriented •group efforts/projects	•solitary projects •fact-oriented research •work that requires careful attention to detail and accuracy •opportunities to "get things done"	•seminar settings, group discussions and brainstorming •class reports, group presentations •opportunities to "work things out" (conceptually)	•written assignments, "thought-pieces" •reading and compare/contrast analyses •opportunities to "think things up"
SOURCES OF CHALLENGE	•abstract connections •ambiguous instructions (no clear goals)	• communication about self (self-disclosure) •group efforts/discussions	•insistence on follow-through, results •supportive evidence •detailed, routinized tasks	•supportive evidence •detailed, routinized tasks •group presentations, tasks

Add THINKING Judgement Function:
- need for order, logic
- need to achieve, obtain sense of mastery
- need to endure, persist
- insistence on careful analysis

Add FEELING Judgement Function:
- need for approval, support, friendship and harmony
- need to feel helpful to peers, others
- need to have work valued, appreciated

William S. Moore
April, 1984

Appendix 3

Exploring Careers Assignment

I. Facts and Figures

A. Education Required: _____

_____

B. Starting Salary: _____

_____

C. Opportunity for Advancement: _____

_____

D. Skills Required: _____

_____

E. Tasks Performed: _____

_____

F. Future Outlook: _____

_____

II. Possibilities & Connections

A. Have you ever done anything (activity, summer job, volunteer position, hobby, etc.) similar to or related to this career? If so, describe:

_____

_____

B. Imagine three different paths this career might lead you to. Describe each in 1-2 sentences:

Path 1. _____

_____

_____

Path 2. _____

_____

_____

Path 3. _____

_____

_____

III. Consequences

A. Analyse the information above under "Facts & Figures." For each category, assess whether it is a positive, negative, or neutral factor and explain why.

1. Education: _____

_____

2. Salary: _____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Advancement: _____

_____

4. Skills: _____

_____

5. Tasks: _____

_____

6. Outlook: _____

_____

B. Now evaluate the information you generated under "Possibilities and Connections."

1. Do you think your background has helped you prepare for this field?

_____

2. For each of your "Paths," analyse how it fits with your values, interests, skills, and lifestyle as we have discussed in class. Use the categories "good fit," "can't say," and "mismatch."

	PATH 1	PATH 2	PATH 3
Values	_____	_____	_____
Interests	_____	_____	_____
Skills	_____	_____	_____
Lifestyle	_____	_____	_____

IV. Reactions

You have systematically generated a lot of information about the career in question. Take a moment to assess your feelings. Do not simply average your positives and negatives, but react to the information in each section. Write a paragraph including:

A. Overall reactions/feelings

B. Effects on people important to you

C. Any major drawbacks

D. Questions which remain unanswered

EDCP 108D

Due: 4/11/83

EXPLORING CAREERS

As we discussed in class, there are a variety of aspects to the process of exploring careers. In order to have you systematically explore some possibilities, we've broken down the process into discrete parts on which we'd like you to focus.

1) Facts and Figures - What concrete information can you find out about this career? For example:
   - What is the starting salary?
   - What training is required?
   - What kinds of specific tasks do people in this career do?

   Report whatever concrete information you feel is appropriate.

2) Possibilities/Connections
   - How does this career relate to past experiences you have had?
   - How does it incorporate your own interests/skills/values?
   - Can you foresee future possibilities for you in this career, and if so, what are those images like?

3) Consequences
   - As you think about this career and its connections to you, how would you analyze the consequences of choosing such a career?
   - What might be the effect of this career on the life-style you would have?
   - What do you think would happen if you choose this career path?

4) Reactions
   - How do you or would you feel about making this career choice?
   - How would it affect the people in your life who are important to you?
   - What do you feel are still important questions left unanswered?

Think about each of your different career possibilities in this way, and be as thorough as you feel is necessary in each section.

NOTE: The format of your reports should be set up as indicated - do 1), then 2), then 3), then 4). Any additional comments/reactions you have can be included at the end of the report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

William S. Moore
1983

References

Campbell, D. P. and Hansen, J. C. Manual for the SVIB-SCII, Third Edition. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1981.

Cornfeld, J. L., and Knefelkamp, L. L. "Combining Student Stage and Style in the Design of Learning Environments: Using Holland Typologies and Perry Stages." Farmville, VA: Center for Applications of Developmental Instruction (CADI), 1979, 1983.

Deines, J. T. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Categories of College Major and Selected Measures of Cognitive Style." (doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School and University Cetner, 1970). Diss. Abstracts, 1979, 32, 785A.

Haney, T. and Howland, P. "Career Courses for Credit: Necessity or Luxury?" Journal of College Placement, Winter, 1978, 75-79.

Jung, C. G. Psychological Types. In R.F.C. Hull (Ed.), The Collected Works of C. G. Jung. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Kainez, R. I. "Documentation for Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT): Computer Program." Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type (CAPT), 1976.

Knefelkamp, L. L. "Developmental Instruction: Fostering Intellectual and Personal Growth in College Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1974.

Knefelkamp, L. L., and Slepitza, R. L. "A Cognitive-Developmental Model of Career Development--An Adaptation of the Perry Scheme. "The Counseling Psychologist, 1976, 6, 53-58.

McCaulley, M. "The MBTI and the Teaching-Learning Process." Gainesville, FL: CAPT, 1976.

McCaulley, M. "Personality Variables: Model Profiles That Characterize the Various Fields of Science and Wnat They Mean for Education." Journal of College Science Teaching, November, 1977, 114-120.

McCaulley, M. "Jung's Theory of Psychological Types and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator." Gainesville, FL: CAPT, 1981.

Myers, I.B. Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962.

Payne, A. B., Moore, W. S., and Settle, W. "Encouraging Students to Plan Ahead." Presentation at ACPA National Conference, Detroit, Michigan, 1982.

Payne, A. B. "Sex Differences in EDCP 108D Students: Interests. "Unpublished paper, Univeristy of Maryland, College Park, MD, 1980.

Perry, W. G. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Touchton, J. G., Wertheimer, L. C., Cornfeld, J. L., and Harrison, K. H. "Career Planning and Decision-Making: A Developmental Approach to the Classroom." The Counseling Psychologist, 1977, 6(4), 42-47.

Widick, C. "An Evaluation of Developmental Instruction in a University Setting." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1975.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE